DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 201 249 HE 013 725

AUTHOR Moore, William S., Comp.
TITLE Excerpts from the: Commuter Institution Index.
INSTITUTION National Clearinghouse for Commuter Programs, College Park, Md.
PUB DATE Apr 81
NOTE 46p.; Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the American College Personnel Association (Cincinnati, OH, April 1981). Tables may not reproduce well due to marginal legibility of original document.
AVAILABLE FROM National Clearinghouse for Commuter Programs, University of Maryland, 1195 Student Union, College Park, MD 20742 ($3.00 for full index).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Commuter Colleges; *Commuting Students; Comparative Analysis; Educational Counseling; Food Service; Higher Education; *Institutional Characteristics; Institutional Research; Off Campus Facilities; Orientation; Part Time Students; Place of Residence; Private Colleges; School Size; State Universities; Statistical Data; *Student College Relationship; Student Needs; Student Organizations; Student Participation; *Student Personnel Services; Student Transportation; Tutorial Programs; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

Information about and excerpts from the 1981 "Commuter Institution Index," an annual publication on research on commuter institutions of higher education are presented. The Index provides an overview of the demographic characteristics of responding institutions and the functions most frequently performed by these institutions for commuters. It includes statistical analyses of institutional type, size, control, and membership status in the National Clearinghouse for Commuter Programs. Tables also allow assessment of the services offered by specific institutions. Over 600 institutions were surveyed in 1981, including 200 community/junior colleges. Findings regarding the following are presented: the percentage of commuters in student populations, the percentage of part-time students, the percentage of students living 2-20 miles from campus, the percentage of all students living with parents, and general trends. Specific functions performed by institutions on behalf of commuting students are listed under the following broad categories: service function, program function, advocacy function, and research function. These functions include the following: orientation programs for commuters, off-campus facilities, counseling and tutorial programs geared to commuters, student voice in programming decisions, transportation for commuters, and research on commuters' needs. Excerpts from the "Functions Available by Institution" list are included. (SW)

ED201249

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
National Clearinghouse for Commuter Programs
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Excerpts From The:

COMMUTER INSTITUTION INDEX

National Clearinghouse for Commuter Programs

Compiled by:

Bill Moore

Spring 1981

Prepared for the American College Personnel Association National Conference

Cincinnati, Ohio, April 1981

HE 013 225

Commuter Institution Index(excerpts)

William S. Moore
Spring, 1981

ABSTRACT

The Commuter Institution Index, produced annually by the National Clearinghouse for Commuter Programs, is a compendium of research on commuter institutions of higher education around the country. For the 1981 Index, over 600 institutions were surveyed with respect to 1) general demographic characteristics of their student populations, and 2) available service, program, advocacy, and research functions. Results are reported by institution size, control, type, and Clearinghouse membership, with major significant differences being highlighted in the text of the report. Additionally, the Index contains a series of illustrative tables, including an elaborate analysis of responding institutions and the various commuter-related functions they offer. Thus, the Index can be used to determine institutions around the country which offer a particular function, or to determine which functions a particular institution offers to its commuter students. In either case it can be a valuable tool for gathering information and/or advice about particular efforts being considered on a given campus.

Table of Contents

	Page
Preface	i
Introduction	1
Profile of Sample	2
Institutional Type Classification System	3
Highlights of Overall Results:	5
Services-Programs-Advocacy-Research/ Overall	8
Size Comparisions	8
Control Comparisons	10
Institutional Type Comparisons	11
Selected Tables:	
A. Percentages of Part-time Students	13
B. Percentages of Students in Total Student Body	14
C. Percentages of Students Living 2-10 Miles from Campus	15
D. Percentages of Students Living with Parents	16
E. Percentage of Part-time Students by Percentage of Commuters(Comprehensive universities and colleges only)	17
F. Programming Approach by Percentage of Commuters (Comprehensive universities and colleges only)	18
G. Programming Approach by Institutional Types-- Clearinghouse Members versus Non-Members	19
Key to Tables H and I	20
H. Services, Programs, Advocacy and Research Efforts by Size, Control and Clearinghouse Membership	21
I. Services, Programs, Advocacy and Research Efforts by Institutional Type	23
J. Excerpts from "Functions Available by Institution" list (one page each for Services, Programs, Advocacy, Research)	25
National Clearinghouse for Commuter Programs description	29

Preface

The 1981 Commuter Institution Index consists of four parts designed to meet a variety of informational needs.

Beginning with our interpretive text, the Index provides an overview of the demographic description of the responding institutions by type (see section on Classification System for details). In addition, it summarizes the functions the (services, programs, advocacy and research) most frequently performed by these institutions. For those wishing more detailed information, three tables providing exact percentages of response to various survey items have included, along with a variety of crosstabulations examing the interrelationships among the various breakdowns of institutions - type, size, control , and Clearinghouse membership - with a number of the items on the questionnaire. Significant patterns and/or differences found in these analyses are discussed in the text.

A series of grids which enumerate specific functions by institutions follows. These data can be used in several ways. To assess "the state of the art" in commuter student services or in a particular function (listed across the tops of the pages), locate the function and scan down the column on the page(s) to note which institutions (organized by institutional classification on the left side of the page) have been involved in that function (designated by an " 1 "in the column.

To assess the offerings of a particular institution, locate the college or university of your choice and scan across the row on that page and the following pages where that institution has been listed. The list of institutions has been repeated four times, once

for each function area of services, programs, advocacy and research.

Some other potential uses of the Index are:

- gathering ideas for what you can do (see what colleges similar to yours are doing).
- locating institutions near you which offer a function you may wish to start in order that you might see one example in progress.
- identifying institutions offering more comprehensive packages of services, program advocacy and research functions for the purpose of contacting them for advice.

For your convenience, a list of survey respondents, arranged alphabetically by institution, has been included as the fourth section. The list is provided in the hopes of stimulating interchange among member institutions. It is not, however, intended to be an inclusive list of NCCP member institutions.

Introduction

For several years the National Clearinghouse for Commuter Programs (NCCP) has annually surveyed its membership and published the results as the Commuter Institution Index. This past year, for the 1981 edition of the Index, the decision was made to sample a broader range of institutions, and in particular, community and junior colleges.

To this end, in November, 1980, questionnaires were mailed to the 211 different institutions represented in the Clearinghouse membership, an additional sample of 200 from the ACPA Commission XVII Commuter Programs mailing list (excluding community colleges and Clearinghouse members), and another 200 community/junior colleges from the membership roles of the American Association for Community and Junior Colleges. A follow-up letter was sent in January, 1981, and the final results on which this report is based represent information on 354 schools, or an overall response rate of 58%. For the three subsamples, the response rates were as follows: Clearinghouse members - 76.7%; ACPA mailing list - 51%; community/junior college sample - 45.5%.

A word of caution about interpreting these results: the data is not intended to accurately reflect the population of all institutions of higher education according to the breakdowns herein. The schools sampled, other than the specific community/junior college sample , represent institutions with some measure of interest in and commitment to commuter students, given that they are either Clearinghouse members or have requested to be on the Commuter Programs mailing list. Nevertheless, there is a broad range of kinds of institutions represented - major research universities, large land-grant universities, private liberal arts colleges, public community colleges, and others. The data thus presents a mixture of commuter

institution profiles, by type of institution, and specific information about which institutions offer what particular kinds of efforts in the area of commuter programs, services, advocacy and research.

PROFILE OF THE INDEX SAMPLE

	* Research	Other Doctorate	Comp. Univ. and Colleges	Liberal Arts Colleges	2 yr. Colleges	Overall
	(raw number/percent of total sample)					
NCCP Members	16/4.5	22/6.2	94/26.6	10/2.8	20/5.6	162/46
NCCP Non-members	20/5.6	15/4.2	52/14.7	15/4.2	90/25.4	192/54
Total	36/10.1	37/10.4	146/41.3	25/7.0	110/31.0	354/100

Control	N	Percentage	Size	N	Percentage
Public	253	71.5	5000 students	168	47.5
Private	101	28.5	5-15,000 students	131	37.1
			15,000 students	55	15.6

Size by Type (N/% of total sample)	* Research	Other Doctorate	Comp. Univ. & Colleges	Liberal Arts	2 yr. Comm/Jr. Colleges	Overall
≤5000 students	1/.3	1/.3	65/8.4	25/7.1	76/21.5	168/47
5-15,000 students	8/2.3	19/5.4	73/20.6	0	31/8.8	131/37
≥15,000 students	27/7.6	17/4.8	8/2.3	0	3/.8	55/16
						354/100

* See page 3, "Institutional Type Classification System."

Institutional Type Classification System

In order to add a much-needed refinement to earlier editions of the "Index", a 1976 Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education report was used to classify the institutions surveyed into five main types. The original system was developed in 1970 for use by the Carnegie Commission, and it has since been used extensively for research and analysis of higher education. Based on 1976-77 data, the classifications were updated and published again, and it is this version which is used with our study.

Initially the institutions were coded according to the specific sub-categories described below, but for purposes of analysis only the major divisions - research universities, doctorate-granting universities, comprehensive universities and colleges, liberal arts colleges, and two-year colleges and institutions were used. For the handful of institutions not found in the Carnegie report, current editions of institutional guides were consulted to provide the necessary information.

The following is the Carnegie classification system used to code the Index respondents:

1) Research Universities I - The 50 leading universities based on federal financial support of academic sciences and provided they awarded at least 50 Ph.D.'s in 1973-74.

2) Research Universities II - Universities either in the top 100 in terms of federal financial support, awarding at least 50 Ph.D.'s, or among the top 60 institutions in terms of total Ph.D.'s awarded from 1965-66 to 1974-75.

3) Doctorate-Granting Universities I - Awarded 40 or more Ph.D.'s in at least five fields (1973-74) or received at least $3 million in total federal support (73-74 or 74-75). If the latter criterion was used, the institution

must have granted at least 20 Ph.D.'s in at least five fields to be included.

4) Doctorate-Granting Universities II - Awarded at least 20 Ph.D.'s (73-74) regardless of field, or 10 Ph.D.'s in at least three fields.

5) Comprehensive Universities and Colleges I - Institutions offering a liberal arts program as well as several other programs, e.g., engineering and/or business administration. Many offer master's programs, but all had either no doctoral programs or very limited doctoral offerings. Additionally, the enrollment (1976) had to be at least 2000 to be considered comprehensive.

6) Comprehensive Universities and Colleges II - State and private colleges offering a liberal arts program and at least one professional or occupational program, e.g., teacher training, or nursing. Minimum enrollments (1976) for classification here were 1500 for private institutions and 1000 for public institutions.

7) Liberal Arts Colleges I - Institutions scoring 1030 or more on Alexander Astin's selectivity index (Higher Education Research Institute, Los Angeles, California) or included among the top 200 leading bachelor's degree institutions in terms of numbers of graduates receiving Ph.D.'s from 40 leading doctorate-granting institutions from 1920-1966 (National Academy of Sciences, Doctorate Recipients from Unified States Universities, 1958-1966, Washington, D.C., 1967, Appendix B, cited in the Carnegie report from which this system is taken).

8) Liberal Arts Colleges II - All liberal arts colleges not meeting the criteria for inclusion in the first liberal arts grouping.

9) Two-year colleges/ Institutes--Includes community and junior colleges, two-year junior/senior institutions, and a variety of technical schools. (summarized from Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, A Classification of Institutions of Higher Education, Berkeley, CA, 1967.)

Descriptive Summary Sheet on Commuters and Commuter Institutions

(from the 1981 Commuter Institution Index by William S. Moore, published by the National Clearinghouse for Commuter Programs)

Based on a sample of 355 institutions from the United States and Canada, ranging from technical schools and community colleges to small liberal arts colleges to major research universities, the following description can be drawn:

Percentage of Commuters in Student Populations

- the median commuter percentage, overall is 66-80%, and ranges from a low of 26-40% in liberal arts colleges to a high of 100% in community/junior colleges;
- the median percentage of commuters is 81-95% in public institutions and 41-65% in private institutions;

Percentage of Part-time Students

- the median overall is 26-40%, ranging from a high of 41-65% in community/junior colleges to a low of 0-10% in research universities;
- the median percentage in public institutions is 26-40% and in private institutions, 11-25%;

Percentage of Students Living 2-10 miles from campus

- the median percentage overall, and in all subgroupings except community/ junior colleges and public institutions, is 26-40% - in the latter two instances the median is 41-65%;

Percentage of all students living with parents

- the overall median is 26-40% - for research and other doctorate-granting institutions, it is only 11-25%, while for private institutions as a subsample, it is 41-65%;

General Trends

- in comprehensive universities and colleges, the largest institutional grouping in our sample, there is a significant (.0004) connection between commuters and part-time students - the greater the percentage of commuters, the greater the percentage of part-time students.
- overall, 36% of the institutions surveyed have a person with designated commuter responsibilities (ranging from a high of 56% in research and other doctorate-granting institutions to a low of 11% in community/junior colleges);
- of the 36% with a designated "commuter person", 28% are assistant or associate deans of students, while only 18% of the staff titles reflect a commuter role (e.g., commuter affairs, commuter center, commuter advisor, etc.).

FUNCTIONS PERFORMED BY INSTITUTIONS ON BEHALF OF COMMUTING STUDENTS[1]

SERVICE FUNCTION

Transportation programs ranging from bus services to car pools, to preferred parking; special meal plans; overnight facilities for commuting students; lounges in classroom buildings; shower facilities; lockers; information centers; child care; off-campus housing referrals; and brochures on relevant topics.

PROGRAM FUNCTION

Separate commuter orientation; outpost centers in densely populated areas; programs to promote interaction with faculty and staff; commuter student organizations; specialized counseling for commuters; specialized academic advising; tutorial services; on-campus day social programs; and workshops on related topics.

ADVOCACY FUNCTION

Tenant/landlord legal information; commuter perspective represented in institutional planning; commuter perspective represented in intramural and recreational programs, part-time employment on campus for commuters; activities which encourage commuter participation in Health Center usage; recreation; traffic policy formulation; financial aid policies; student activities; and student government.

RESEARCH FUNCTION

Demographic study; commuter needs assessment; commuter development assessment; commuter and resident comparison studies; freshman studies only, longitudinal studies; commuter usage of facilities and service; faculty and staff attitudes towards commuters.

[1]A summary report of college and university activity by function as recorded by Kris Girrell in Commuter Institution Index, 1980. National Clearinghouse for Commuter Programs.

SERVICES - PROGRAMS - ADVOCACY - RESEARCH

OVERALL

- Services provided to commuters at institutions in our sample range from highs for "information centers" (76.8% overall) and "lounges in classroom buildings" (73.1%) to lows for "on-campus overnight facilities" (11.2%) and "carpoolers' parking" (16.3%);
- Programs provided by our sample institutions ranged from highs for "interaction with faculty and staff" (60.2%) and "on-campus day social programs for commuters" (56.3%) to lows for "specialized academic advising" (16.8%) and "outpost centers" (19.4%);
- The percentages of institutions providing advocacy efforts is higher than any other category, ranging from a high of 88.9% for "on-campus employment" to a low of 45% for "traffic policy formulation";
- As one might expect, research efforts are provided by a lower percentage of institutions in our sample: the lows are "faculty and staff attitudes towards commuters" (14%), "longitudinal studies" (25%), "commuter/resident comparisons" (28%), and "freshman studies" (28%) - the highs, "commuter demographic studies (62%) and "commuter needs assessments" (67%).

SIZE COMPARISONS

Small, less than 5000 students
Medium, 5000-15,000 students (based on 1976 Carnegie Commission figures)
Large, over 15,000 students

Services

- In general, as one would expect, as institution size increased, the percentage of universities/colleges offering a given service increased, with the exception of shower facilities (when the trend was reversed);
- Significantly fewer small schools provided "child care", 32% as compared to medium sized (51%) or large (46%) institutions;

Programs

- Fewer large institutions offered "outpost centers"(10%), "specialized academic advising"(8%), and "tutorial services"(25%) than did either medium-sized(22%, 17%, and 43%, respectively) or small(21%, 20%, and 43%, respectively) institutions;
- Significantly fewer small institutions provided "workshops" (32%) than either medium-sized (57%) or large (50%) institutions.

Advocacy

- Significantly fewer small institutions provided "tenant-landlord legal information" (35% to 64% for medium and 87% for large) and "activities to encourage commuter health center usage" (46% to 68% for medium and 64% for large);

Research

-Somewhat fewer large institutions (23% to 30% and 29%, respectively, for small and medium) do "commuter developmental assessments";

-Somewhat fewer small universities/colleges (22% to 30% and 34% for medium and large, respectively) do "commuter/resident comparisons", and likewise "freshman studies" (22% to 25% for medium and 32% for large).

INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL COMPARISON

(PUBLIC VS. PRIVATE)

Services

- A consistently higher percentage of public institutions versus private institutions provided the specified services, with the exceptions of on-campus overnight facilities (public 8.8%, private 17.0%) and lockers for commuters (public 59.6%, private 72.0%);

Programs

- Significantly more private institutions offer "commuter orientation sessions" (47% to 25%) and "commuter student organizations" (61% to 35%), while significantly more public institutions provided "outpost centers" (21% to 6%) and "workshops" (42% to 31%);

Advocacy

- Significantly more public institutions (47% to 33%) provided "traffic policy formulation";

Research

- A consistently higher percentage of public institutions provide research efforts, with the exception of "freshman studies" (17% public, 21% private) - the largest differences are in "demographic studies" (50% to 35%) and "longitudinal studies" (28% to 15%).

COMPARISONS BY INSTITUTION TYPE

Research Universities
Other Doctorate-Granting Universities
Comprehensive Universities and Colleges
Liberal Arts Colleges
Community/Junior Colleges
(categories drawn from Carnegie Council Classification system, 1976)

Services

- In comparing institution types, there are a number of distinct differences in services offered:
  1) a far higher percentage of research universities offer on-campus bus services than any other institutional group;
  2) none of the liberal arts colleges sampled offered parking for carpoolers;
  3) solid majorities of the types offer classroom lounges, lockers for commuters (community/junior colleges low at 46.4%), information centers (liberal arts colleges low at 54.2%), and off-campus housing operations (community/junior colleges low at 70.9%).

Programs

- 50% of research universities and liberal arts colleges provided "commuter orientation sessions", but only 6% of community/junior colleges did so;
- 40% of the community/junior college sample offered "outpost centers," while none of the research universities did; similarly, only 7% of the comprehensive universities and 4% of liberal arts colleges ran such a program;
- Similarly, 49% of the community college sample provided for "tutorial services" as compared to 8% of liberal arts colleges and an average of 15% for research and other doctorate-granting institutions.

Advocacy

- Percentages of institutions offering "tenant-landlord legal information" ranged from research universities (91%) to comprehensive universities (62%)

to liberal arts (42%) to community/junior colleges (18%);

- somewhat fewer research universities (47%) provided "commuter perspective in intramurals" than any other institution type (ranging from next low, liberal arts, 54%, to 69% of community/junior colleges).

Research

- Across the range of research activities, other doctorate-granting institutions and community/junior colleges conduct slightly more research (approximately 30% each to 25% for research universities and comprehensive universities and colleges and 22% for liberal arts colleges);
- in specific categories, research universities most often do "demographic studies" (53%) and "needs assessments" (47%), and seldom do "commuter developmental assessment" (11%) and "faculty/staff attitudes toward commuters" (6%);
- only 25% of the liberal arts sample did "demographic studies," but 46% did "need assessments";
- comprehensive universities and colleges were similar to the research universities other than slightly fewer doing "demographic studies" (40% to 53%) and "commuter/resident comparisons" (24% to 33%), while slightly more do "developmental assessments" (19% to 11%) and "longitudinal studies" (21% to 14%);
- more community/junior colleges provide "demographic studies" (56%) and "faculty/staff attitudes toward commuters" (16% to the next highest, liberal arts and comprehensive , 8% each) - community/junior colleges represent the lowest percentages in "commuter/resident comparisons" (obviously) (9%), and "freshman studies only" (13%, next lowest liberal arts at 17%).

A

Percentages of Part-time Students by Institutional Type, Control, and Clearinghouse Membership

Percentage of Part-time Students	Total Sample	Institution Type					Control	
		Research	Other Doctorate	Comp. Univ.	Liberal Arts	Comm./Jr. College	Public	Private
Less than 10%	21.8	42.4	16.7	25.0	48.0	6.7	14.3	39.2
11-25%	21.8	33.3	38.9	26.5	16.0	7.6	21.1	23.7
26-40%	16.2	6.1	8.3	16.9	28.0	18.1	17.3	13.4
41-65%	25.7	0	25.0	22.8	8.0	41.9	29.5	16.5
66-80%	7.8	0	2.8	2.2	0	21.0	11.0	0
81-95%	1.5	0	0	.7	0	3.8	2.1	0
Unknown	5.4	18.2	8.3	5.9	0	1.0	4.6	7.2

Percentage of Part-time Students	Total	Clearinghouse Member	Non-Member
less than 10	21.8	21.6	22.1
10-25	21.8	23.5	20.4
26-40	16.2	18.3	14.4
41-65	25.7	27.5	23.8
66-80	7.8	3.3	11.6
81-95	1.5	0	2.8
Unknown	5.4	5.9	5.0

B

Percentages of Commuter Students in Total Student Body

Percent Commuters	Total Sample	Institution Type					Control		Clearinghouse Membership	
		Research	Other Doct.	Comp. Univ. & Coll.	Liberal Arts	Com./Jr. College	Public	Private	Mem.	Non-Mem.
<10	3.8	2.8	5.7	3.5	16.7	.9	2.0	8.3	1.9	5.3
11-25	5.5	5.6	2.9	5.6	20.8	2.8	3.6	10.4	3.8	7.0
26-40	7.5	2.8	5.7	13.4	12.5	.9	4.4	15.6	10.8	4.8
41-65	22.0	33.3	45.7	26.8	20.8	4.6	18.1	32.3	26.6	18.2
66-80	14.2	38.9	22.9	15.5	4.2	4.6	14.5	14.6	16.5	12.3
81-95	12.8	16.7	8.6	19.0	0	7.3	15.3	6.3	14.6	11.2
>95	2.0	0	2.9	2.1	4.2	1.8	2.4	1.0	3.2	1.1
100	31.6	0	5.7	12.7	20.8	77.1	39.0	11.5	22.2	39.6
Unknown	.6	0	0	1.4	0	0	.8	0	.6	.5

C

Percentages of Students Living 2-10 Miles from Campus

Percent Students	Total Sample	Institution Type					Control		Clearinghouse Membership	
		Research	Other Doct.	Comp. Univ. & Coll.	Liberal Arts	Com./Jr. College	Public	Private	Mem.	Non-Mem.
< 10	5.8	2.8	0	9.1	17.4	1.9	4.9	8.2	2.5	8.6
11-25	16.8	27.8	19.4	18.2	13.0	11.2	17.4	15.5	17.7	16.1
26-40	18.0	22.2	27.8	11.9	26.1	19.6	16.6	21.6	20.9	15.6
41-65	16.5	11.1	8.3	15.4	21.7	21.5	17.0	14.4	16.5	16.7
66-80	12.5	11.1	2.8	14.7	0	15.9	13.8	9.3	13.3	11.3
81-95	8.1	2.8	11.1	7.0	8.7	10.3	8.1	8.2	7.6	8.6
> 95	2.6	2.8	2.8	2.1	8.7	1.9	1.6	5.2	1.9	3.2
Unknown	19.7	19.4	27.8	21.7	4.3	17.8	20.6	17.5	19.6	19.9

15

D

Percentages of Students who Live with their Parents

Percent Students	Total Sample	Institution Type					Control		Clearinghouse Membership	
		Research	Other Doct.	Comp. Univ. & Coll.	Liberal Arts	Com./Jr. College	Public	Private	Mem.	Non-Mem.
<10	14.2	38.9	13.5	14.1	33.3	1.9	11.7	20.4	8.9	18.6
11-25	16.5	30.6	27.0	16.2	4.2	11.1	18.5	11.2	16.5	16.0
26-40	18.2	5.6	21.6	14.1	8.3	28.7	20.6	12.2	22.2	14.9
41-65	16.2	5.6	2.7	19.0	20.8	19.4	14.1	21.4	17.7	14.9
66-80	9.2	0	8.1	11.3	16.7	8.3	7.3	14.3	12.0	6.9
81-95	2.6	0	0	2.8	4.2	3.7	1.6	5.1	2.5	2.7
>95	1.2	2.8	0	.7	4.2	.9	.4	3.1	1.9	.5
Unknown	22.0	16.7	27.0	21.8	8.3	25.9	25.8	12.2	18.4	25.5

16

E

Percentage of Part-time Students by Percentage of Commuters
(for comprehensive universities and colleges only)

Percent Part-time	Total	Percent of Commuters								
		<10	11-25	26-40	41-65	66-80	81-95	>95	100	Unknown
<10	24.1	20	42.9	57.9	20.0	25.0	15.4	0	0	50.0
11-25	27.1	20	42.9	21.1	45.7	40.0	11.5	33.3	0	0
26-40	16.5	0	0	15.8	8.6	25.0	26.9	33.3	12.5	50.0
41-65	23.3	40	14.3	0	11.4	10.0	34.6	33.3	7.5	0
66-80	2.3	20	0	0	0	0	3.8	0	6.3	0
81-95	.8	0	0	0	0	0	3.8	0	0	0
>95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	6.0	0	0	5.3	14.3	C.	3.8	0	6.3	0

chi square = 88.33 sig. = .0004

F

Programming Approach by Percentage of Commuters
(comprehensive universities and colleges)

	Programming Approach	Total	Percentage of Commuters: 10	11-25	26-40	41-65	66-80	81-95	95	100	Unknown
1	Separate Prog. & Services	1.5	0	0	0	0	0	3.8	33.3	0	0
2	Integrated Prog. w/commuter perspective	26.7	60.0	28.6	17.6	35.1	31.8	26.9	0	0	6.3
3	Undifferen-tiated	45.9	20.0	57.1	47.1	35.1	27.3	46.2	66.7	50.0	93.8
4	Combination (1) & (2)	25.9	20.0	14.3	35.3	29.7	40.0	23.1	0	50.0	0

chi square = 51.1 sig. = .001

G

Programming Approach by Institution Type
(members versus non-members)

		CLEARINGHOUSE MEMBERS					NON-MEMBERS				
	Programming Approach	Research[1]	Other Doct.[2]	Comp. Univ.[3]	Liberal Arts[4]	Com./Jr. College[5]	Research	Other Doct.	Comp. Univ.	Liberal Arts	Com./Jr. College
1	Separate Prog. & Services	6.3	5.3	1.1	0	0	0	0	2.0	0	1.2
2	Integrated Prog. w/com. perspective	37.5	26.3	23.6	0	0	5.6	20.0	32.0	28.6	5.9
3	Undifferentiated	25.0	26.3	46.1	80.0	93.8	66.7	73.3	48.0	71.4	88.2
4	Combination (1) & (2)	31.3	42.1	29.2	20.0	6.3	22.8	6.7	18.0	0	4.7

chi square: 1 = 8.48, sig. = .04
chi square: 2 = 8.85, sig. = .03
chi square: 3 = 2.64, sig. = .45
chi square: 4 = 5.71, sig. = .06
chi square: 5 = 1.24, sig. = .74

19

4.

KEY TO TABLES H AND I

SERVICES

15 On-campus bus service
16 Off-campus bus service
17 Car-pool services
18 Preferred parking for carpoolers
19 Special commuter meal plans on campus
20 On-campus overnight facilities for commuters
21 Lounges in classroom buildings
22 Shower facilities
23 Lockers for commuters
24 Information center
25 Child care
26 Off-campus housing referral
27 Brochures on relevant commuter topics

PROGRAMS

28 Separate commuter orientation sessions
29 Outpost centers in densely populated areas
30 Programs to promote interaction with faculty and staff
31 Commuter student organizations
32 Specialized counseling for commuters
33 Specialized academic advising for commuters
34 Tutorial services for commuters
35 On-campus day social programs for commuters
36 Workshops on related topics

ADVOCACY

37 Tenant-landlord legal information
38 Commuter perspective represented in institutional planning
39 Commuter perspective represented in intramural and recreational programming
40 Part-time employment on campus for commuters

Activities to encourage commuter student participation in:

41 Health center usage
42 Recreation
43 Traffic policy formulation
44 Financial aid policies
45 Student activities/Student government

RESEARCH

46 Demographic studies of commuters
47 Commuter needs assessment
48 Commuter developmental assessment
49 Commuter and resident student comparison
50 Freshman studies only
51 Longitudinal studies
52 Commuter usage of facilities and services
53 Faculty and staff attitudes toward commuters

H

Percent with Services by Size, Membership, Control

	Overall	<5000	5-15,000	≥15,000	Member	Non-Mem.	Public	Private
15	22.6	8.5	27.7	52.7	27.3	18.5	22.8	22.0
16	35.8	22.6	46.9	49.1	39.8	32.3	38.8	28.0
17	59.6	47.0	69.2	74.5	73.3	48.1	63.2	50.0
18	16.3	6.7	19.2	38.2	23.0	10.6	16.0	17.0
19	33.2	29.3	32.3	47.3	37.3	29.6	32.4	35.0
20	11.2	11.0	11.5	10.9	17.4	5.8	8.8	17.0
21	73.1	76.2	68.5	74.5	75.8	70.4	72.8	73.0
22	49.6	51.8	49.2	43.6	52.2	46.6	48.8	50.0
23	63.6	64.0	63.1	63.6	79.5	49.2	59.6	72.0
24	76.8	65.9	85.4	89.1	78.9	74.6	78.4	72.0
25	41.3	32.3	50.8	45.5	46.6	36.0	49.2	21.0
26	83.4	78.0	85.4	94.5	83.9	82.0	83.2	82.0
27	35.8	21.3	48.5	49.1	45.3	27.5	38.4	29.0
	Percent with Programs by Size, Membership, Control							
28	31.3	29.8	38.3	50.0	42.9	21.7	25.2	47.0
29	16.8	20.6	21.7	10.4	9.9	22.8	21.2	6.0
30	52.4	68.8	56.5	.8	52.8	52.4	50.4	57.0
31	42.5	44.0	54.8	50.0	52.8	33.9	35.2	61.0
32	18.5	19.1	24.3	20.8	24.2	13.8	20.8	13.0
33	14.5	19.9	16.5	8.3	18.0	11.6	16.0	11.0
34	34.8	43.3	42.6	25.0	36.0	33.9	36.0	32.0
35	48.7	54.6	63.5	43.8	60.2	38.6	49.2	48.0
36	38.5	31.9	57.4	50.0	47.2	31.2	41.6	31.0

H

Percent with Advocacy Efforts by Size, Membership, and Control

	Overall	<5000	5-15,000	>15,000	Member	Non-Mem.	Public	Private
37	51.9	34.6	64.2	88.9	62.1	43.4	53.2	48.0
38	61.5	61.6	69.1	59.3	67.1	57.1	60.0	65.0
39	64.4	64.8	74.0	59.3	67.7	61.4	66.4	59.0
40	84.6	87.4	90.2	85.2	82.6	86.2	84.4	85.0
41	55.0	45.9	68.3	64.8	62.1	48.7	56.8	50.0
42	74.9	78.6	79.7	74.1	79.5	70.9	76.0	72.0
43	43.0	39.6	49.6	48.1	43.5	42.3	47.2	33.0
44	59.8	66.7	58.5	57.4	59.0	60.3	62.4	53.0
45	84.0	90.6	85.4	83.3	87.6	81.0	84.4	83.0

Percent with Research Efforts by Size, Membership, Control

46	46.2	57.9	68.2	59.1	47.8	44.4	50.4	35.0
47	49.3	62.6	74.8	56.8	55.9	43.4	50.0	48.0
48	20.8	29.9	29.0	22.7	22.4	19.6	22.0	18.0
49	20.2	22.4	29.9	34.1	28.0	13.8	20.4	20.0
50	18.2	21.5	25.2	31.8	22.4	14.8	17.2	21.0
51	23.9	29.9	35.5	29.5	24.8	23.3	27.6	15.0
52	34.2	41.1	54.2	40.9	41.6	28.0	36.8	27.0
53	10.0	15.0	13.1	11.4	9.3	10.6	11.2	7.0

Percent with Staff Person Designated with Commuter Responsibilities

55	36.0				46.6	27.0	33.6	42.0

I

Percent with Services by Institution Type

	Overall	Research	Other Doctorate	Comp. Uni./ & Colleges	Liberal Arts	Com./Jr. Colleges
15	22.6	63.9	29.7	25.0	4.2	7.3
16	35.8	58.3	54.1	38.2	16.7	22.7
17	59.6	63.9	73.0	64.6	25.0	54.5
18	16.3	36.1	27.0	20.1	0	4.5
19	33.2	52.8	48.6	39.6	37.5	11.8
20	11.2	11.1	18.9	14.6	20.8	1.8
21	73.1	72.2	75.7	72.9	75.0	71.8
22	49.6	36.1	51.4	52.8	50.0	48.2
23	63.6	52.8	67.6	77.1	66.7	46.4
24	76.8	88.9	83.8	77.8	54.2	73.6
25	41.3	33.3	51.4	45.1	12.5	40.9
26	83.4	100.0	91.9	86.8	75.0	70.9
27	35.8	50.0	54.1	44.4	20.8	16.4
			Percent with Program Functions by Institution Type			
28	31.3	50.0	48.6	38.2	50.0	6.4
29	16.8	0	10.8	6.9	4.2	40.0
30	52.4	38.9	45.9	48.6	66.7	60.9
31	42.5	63.9	48.6	47.2	33.3	29.1
32	18.5	16.7	29.7	18.1	12.5	17.3
33	14.5	8.3	16.2	11.1	12.5	20.9
34	34.8	16.7	13.5	38.2	8.3	49.1
35	48.7	33.3	48.6	54.9	37.5	48.2
36	38.5	38.9	54.1	43.8	25.0	29.1

I

Percent with Advocacy Efforts by Institution Type

	Overall	Research	Other Doctorate	Comp. Univ. & Colleges	Liberal Arts	Com./Jr. Colleges
37	51.9	91.7	81.1	61.8	41.7	18.2
38	61.5	36.1	64.9	70.1	45.8	60.9
39	64.4	47.2	64.9	66.7	54.2	69.1
40	84.6	83.3	81.1	87.5	83.3	82.7
41	55.0	58.3	59.5	61.1	50.0	45.5
42	74.9	66.7	70.3	77.1	75.0	76.4
43	43.0	44.4	40.5	45.1	20.8	45.5
44	59.8	52.8	43.2	56.9	50.0	73.6
45	84.0	77.8	75.7	82.6	87.5	90.0

Percent with Research Efforts by Institution Type

46	46.2	52.8	48.6	40.3	25.0	55.5
47	49.3	47.2	51.4	49.3	45.8	50.0
48	20.8	11.1	21.6	19.4	8.3	28.2
49	20.2	33.3	27.0	23.6	20.8	9.1
50	18.2	27.8	18.9	20.1	16.7	12.7
51	23.9	13.9	21.6	20.8	25.0	31.8
52	34.2	27.8	43.2	31.3	25.0	39.1
53	10.0	5.6	5.4	8.3	8.3	15.5

Percent with Staff Person Designated with Commuter Responsibilities

55	36.0	55.6	56.8	44.4	37.5	10.9

INSTITUTION NAME	TYPE	CC15	CC16	CC17	CC18	CC19	CC20	CC21	CC22	CC23	CC24	CC25	CC26	CC27
U OF MINNESOTA	1	1	1	1	1			1	1	1		1	1	
U OF MIAMI FL	1		1	1		1		1		1	1	1	1	1
HOUSTON U PA	1	1		1	1			1		1	1	1	1	1
COLORADO SU	1		1	1	1	1					1		1	1
UCLA	1		1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1
U OF TEXAS AUSTIN	1		1		1			1			1		1	
OREGON SU	1		1	1	1			1	1	1	1	1	1	1
MICHIGAN SU	1	1	1	1		1		1	1	1	1		1	
DUKE U NC	1	1	1	1				1			1		1	
UC BERKELEY CA	1	1		1	1	1					1	1	1	1
U OF CA DAVIS	1		1	1		1							1	1
U OF WI MADISON	1	1				1		1	1	1	1	1	1	
CORNELL U NY	1	1	1	1	1			1			1		1	1
TEXAS A&M U	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1
WASHINGTON U MO	1		1			1					1		1	
NYU NY	1							1		1	1		1	
U OF PGH PA	1	1		1						1			1	
THE U OF MICHIGAN	1	1		1	1	1	1		1		1		1	1
PURDUE U IN	1							1		1	1		1	1
THE PA SU	1	1				1			1		1	1	1	1
U OF SOUTHERN CA	1	1	1					1	1		1	1	1	
U OF UTAH	1	1	1			1		1			1		1	1
U OF CONNECTICUT	1	1	1			1	1	1		1	1		1	
UC IRVINE	1		1	1		1		1		1	1	1	1	1
U OF CINCINNATI OH	1	1		1	1	1		1		1	1	1	1	
U OF KENTUCKY	1	1		1	1	1		1		1	1		1	1
FLORIDA SU	1	1	1	1				1		1	1	1	1	
ST LOUIS U MO	1			1	1			1	1	1	1		1	
KANSAS SU	1					1					1		1	1
GA INST OF TECH	1	1	1					1	1	1	1		1	
BROWN U RI	1						1		1		1		1	
U OF VERMONT	1		1			1							1	
THE U OF VA	1	1						1			1		1	
CARNEGIE MELLON U PA	1	1						1	1	1	1		1	
U OF TENNESSEE	1	1	1					1		1	1		1	1
SUNY BUFFALO	1		1	1	1	1		1		1	1	1	1	1
U OF NEW HAMPSHIRE		1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1
FORDHAM U BRONX NY		1	1		1			1	1	1	1		1	
U OF HOUSTON TX			1	1				1	1	1	1	1	1	
NORTHEASTERN U MA			1	1				1		1	1	1	1	
ILLINOIS INST TECH		1	1		1	1		1		1	1		1	
U OF CA SNTA BARBARA		1	1		1							1	1	1
U OF DELAWARE		1	1		1			1		1	1		1	
THE AMERICAN U DC			1						1	1	1	1	1	1
U OF MAINE AT ORONO			1		1					1	1		1	1
UC SANTA CRUZ CA		1	1		1			1	1	1		1	1	1
BALL SU IN		1	1		1			1	1		1	1	1	
TEXAS TECH U		1	1		1			1			1		1	
DARTMOUTH C NH													1	
ARIZONA SU		1	1	1	1						1		1	
U OF WI MILWAUKEE			1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1
SUNY ALBANY		1	1		1			1	1	1	1		1	1
ST JOHNS U NY				1	1			1	1	1			1	1
SOUTHERN METH U TX								1		1	1		1	
SUNY BINGHAMTON			1	1				1		1	1	1	1	1
MONTANA SU				1		1						1	1	
U OF RHODE ISLAND			1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
U OF LOUISVILLE KY				1	1	1			1	1	1		1	
U OF SC COLUMBIA		1		1				1			1	1	1	1
MARQULITE U WI				1	1			1	1	1	1		1	
U OF DELAWARE		1	1					1		1	1			1
BOWLING GREEN SU OH	4			1	1		1	1	1	1	1		1	1
U OF AKRON OH	4		1	1						1	1	1	1	
NORTH DAKOTA SU	4	1	1					1		1	1		1	
U OF NEVADA RENO	4			1		1			1			1	1	1
U OF SOUTH DAKOTA	4			1				1		1	1	1	1	
INDIANA SU	4					1					1			
IDAHO SU	4		1			1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
WESTERN MICHIGAN U	4	1		1		1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1
MIAMI U OH	4			1							1		1	1
EAST TEXAS SU	4		1				1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

KEY: Services

15 - On-Campus bus service
16 - Off-Campus bus service
17 - Car-Pool services
18 - Preferred parking for carpoolers
19 - Special commuter meal plans on campus
20 - On-campus overnight facilities for commuters
21 - Lounges in classroom buildings
22 - Shower facilities
23 - Lockers for Commuters
24 - Information Center
25 - Child Care
26 - Off-Campus housing referral
27 - Brochures on relevant commuter topics

INSTITUTION NAME	TYPE	CC28	CC29	CC30	CC31	CC32	CC33	CC34	CC35	CC36
U OF MINNESOTA	1									1
U OF MIAMI FL	1	1		1	1				1	
BOSTON U MA	1	1			1	1		1		1
COLORADO SU	1			1					1	1
UCLA	1	1		1	1				1	1
U OF TEXAS AUSTIN	1									
OREGON SU	1	1						1	1	
MICHIGAN SU	1	1		1	1					
DUKE U NC	1				1					
UC BERKELEY CA	1									
U OF CA DAVIS	1	1		1		1				
U OF WI MADISON	1	1								1
CORNELL U NY	1									
TEXAS A&M U	1	1		1	1	1		1	1	1
WASHINGTON U MO	1	1			1					
NYU NY	1			1	1					1
U OF PGH PA	1				1				1	
THE U OF MICHIGAN	1									1
PURDUE U IN	1	1			1					
THE PA SU	1	1		1	1				1	
U OF SOUTHERN CA	1	1			1					
U OF UTAH	1					1				
U OF CONNECTICUT	2	1			1					1
UC IRVINE	2	1		1	1	1			1	1
U OF CINCINNATI OH	2							1		
U OF KENTUCKY	2	1			1					1
FLORIDA SU	2	1		1	1					
ST LOUIS U MO	2			1	1		1		1	1
KANSAS SU	2				1					
GA INST OF TECH	2									1
BROWN U RI	2			1	1			1		
U OF VERMONT	2	1		1	1	1	1			
THE U OF VA	2				1				1	
CARNEGIE MELLON U PA	2	1			1				1	
U OF TENNESSEE	2									
SUNY BUFFALO	2			1	1		1	1	1	1
U OF NEW HAMPSHIRE	2	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1
FORDHAM U BRONX NY	2				1				1	
U OF HOUSTON TX	2								1	1
NORTHEASTERN U MA	2					1			1	
ILLINOIS INST TECH	2	1		1	1				1	
U OF CA SNTA BARBARA	2	1	1			1				1
U OF DELAWARE	2	1		1	1					1
THE AMERICAN U DC	2	1		1						
U OF MAINE AT ORONO	2			1	1					1
UC SANTA CRUZ CA	2			1						1
BALL SU IN	2	1			1					
TEXAS TECH U	2									
DARTMOUTH C NH	2									
ARIZONA SU	2			1						
U OF WI MILWAUKEE	2		1	1					1	1
SUNY ALBANY	2				1	1			1	1
ST JOHNS U NY	2			1					1	1
SOUTHERN METH U TX	2	1		1	1					
SUNY BINGHAMTON	2	1			1	1			1	1
MONTANA SU	2	1								1
U OF RHODE ISLAND	2	1		1	1	1			1	1
U OF LOUISVILLE KY	2			1						1
U OF SC COLUMBIA	2		1			1			1	1
MARQUETTE U WI	2	1			1					
U OF DELAWARE	2	1		1	1				1	
BOWLING GREEN SU OH	4	1		1	1	1			1	1
U OF AKRON OH	4	1			1		1	1	1	
NORTH DAKOTA SU	4									
U OF NEVADA RENO	4	1		1					1	1
U OF SOUTH DAKOTA	4				1	1	1	1		1
INDIANA SU	4									
IDAHO SU	4			1						
WESTERN MICHIGAN U	4	1								
MIAMI U OH	4	1			1	1	1		1	1
EAST TEXAS SU	4	1	1							

KEY: Programs

28 - Separate commuter orientation sessions

29 - Outpost centers in densely populated areas

30 - Programs to promote interaction with faculty and staff

31 - Commuter student organizations

32 - Specialized counseling for commuters

33 - Specialized academic advising for commuters

34 - Tutorial services for commuters

35 - On-campus day social porgrams for commuters

36 - Workshops on related topics

INSTITUTION NAME	TYPE	CC37	CC38	CC39	CC40	CC41	CC42	CC43	CC44	CC45
N										
U OF MINNESOTA	1	1								
U OF MIAMI FL	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
BOSTON U MA	1	1	1		1	1				1
COLORADO SU	1	1			1	1		1	1	1
UCLA	1	1		1	1	1	1		1	1
U OF TEXAS AUSTIN	1	1			1					
OREGON SU	1	1	1		1	1	1			1
MICHIGAN SU	1	1			1	1	1		1	1
DUKE U NC	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1
UC BERKELEY CA	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
U OF CA DAVIS	1	1	1							
U OF WI MADISON	1	1					1			1
CORNELL U NY	1	1			1	1	1	1		
TEXAS A&M U	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
WASHINGTON U MO	1	1			1					
NYU NY	1	1			1					1
U OF PGH PA	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
THE U OF MICHIGAN	1	1			1					
PURDUE U IN	1	1	1	1			1	1	1	1
THE PA SU	1	1			1	1	1		1	1
U OF SOUTHERN CA	1	1	1		1	1			1	1
U OF UTAH	1	1		1	1		1			1
U OF CONNECTICUT	1	1	1	1	1		1	1		1
UC IRVINE	1	1		1	1	1	1			1
U OF CINCINNATI OH	2			1	1	1	1	1	1	1
U OF KENTUCKY	2	1		1			1			1
FLORIDA SU	2	1			1	1		1	1	1
ST LOUIS U MO	2	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1
KANSAS SU	2	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1
GA INST OF TECH	2	1			1					
BROWN U RI	2				1		1			1
U OF VERMONT	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
THE U OF VA	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1
CARNEGIE MELLON U PA	2									
U OF TENNESSEE	2	1			1	1	1	1	1	1
SUNY BUFFALO	2	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1
U OF NEW HAMPSHIRE	2	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1
FORDHAM U BRONX NY	2		1	1	1					1
U OF HOUSTON TX	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
NORTHEASTERN U MA	2	1	1		1		1		1	1
ILLINOIS INST TECH	2		1	1	1					
U OF CA SNTA BARBARA	2	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1
U OF DELAWARE	2		1		1	1		1	1	1
THE AMERICAN U DC	2	1	1							1
U OF MAINE AT ORONO	2	1						1		1
UC SANTA CRUZ CA	2	1			1	1	1		1	1
BALL SU IN	2	1	1	1	1		1	1		1
TEXAS TECH U	2	1	1	1	1		1			1
DARTMOUTH C NH	2				1			1		
ARIZONA SU	2	1			1	1	1			
U OF WI MILWAUKEE	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
SUNY ALBANY	2	1	1	1	1					
ST JOHNS U NY	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1
SOUTHERN METH U TX	2									
SUNY BINGHAMTON	2	1	1			1	1			
MONTANA SU	2	1			1		1			
U OF RHODE ISLAND	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1
U OF LOUISVILLE KY	3	1	1	1	1					
U OF SC COLUMBIA	3	1	1		1	1	1			1
MARQUETTE U WI	3	1	1	1	1		1		1	1
U OF DELAWARE	4		1		1	1	1	1	1	1
BOWLING GREEN SU OH	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1
U OF AKRON OH	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
NORTH DAKOTA SU	4	1	1			1	1			1
U OF NEVADA RENO	4	1	1	1	1	1	1			1
U OF SOUTH DAKOTA	4	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1
INDIANA SU	4	1		1	1	1	1		1	1
IDAHO SU	4	1			1		1			
WESTERN MICHIGAN U	4	1		1	1	1				1
MIAMI U OH	4	1		1	1	1	1			1
EAST TEXAS SU	4		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

KEY: Advocacy

37 - Tenant-landlord legal information
38 - Commuter perspective represented in institutional planning
39 - Commuter perspective represented in intramural and recreational programming
40 - Part-time employment on campus for commuters

Activities to encourage commuter student participation in:

41 - Health center usage
42 - Recreation
43 - Traffic policy formulation
44 - Financial aid policies
45 - Student activities/Student government

INSTITUTION NAME	TYPE	CC46	CC47	CC48	CC49	CC50	CC51	CC52	CC53	CC54	CC55
U OF MINNESOTA	1	1	1		1		1		1		
U OF MIAMI FL	1										
BOSTON U MA	1	1	1	1				1			1
COLORADO SU	1	1	1	1	1			1			1
UCLA	1	1	1		1	1					
U OF TEXAS AUSTIN	1				1	1	1				
OREGON SU	1		1		1			1			1
MICHIGAN SU	1					1					1
DUKE U NC	1				1						
UC BERKELEY CA	1	1				1	1				
U OF CA DAVIS	1										1
U OF WI MADISON	1	1	1								
CORNELL U NY	1	1	1					1			1
TEXAS A&M U	1	1	1		1	1				1	1
WASHINGTON U MO	1	1									1
NYU NY	1	1	1	1				1	1		1
U OF PGH PA	1					1					1
THE U OF MICHIGAN	1										1
PURDUE U IN	1	1									1
THE PA SU	1				1	1		1			1
U OF SOUTHERN CA	1										1
U OF UTAH	1	1	1					1			1
U OF CONNECTICUT	2				1						
UC IRVINE	2	1	1	1	1			1			1
U OF CINCINNATI OH	2										
U OF KENTUCKY	2		1					1			1
FLORIDA SU	2	1	1		1			1			1
ST LOUIS U MO	2	1				1	1				
KANSAS SU	2										
GA INST OF TECH	2		1								
BROWN U RI	2		1								
U OF VERMONT	2	1	1								1
THE U OF VA	2	1				1					
CARNEGIE MELLON U PA	2										
U OF TENNESSEE	2	1									
SUNY BUFFALO	2	1	1		1	1	1			1	1
U OF NEW HAMPSHIRE	3	1	1			1	1	1			1
FORDHAM U BRONX NY	3										1
U OF HOUSTON TX	3	1	1					1			
NORTHEASTERN U MA	3	1	1	1	1			1			1
ILLINOIS INST TECH	3	1	1	1							1
U OF CA SNTA BARBARA	3	1			1			1			1
U OF DELAWARE	3		1								
THE AMERICAN U DC	3		1					1			1
U OF MAINE AT ORONO	3	1	1					1			1
UC SANTA CRUZ CA	3	1			1		1				
BALL SU IN	3										
TEXAS TECH U	3										
DARTMOUTH C NH	3										
ARIZONA SU	3										1
U OF WI MILWAUKEE	3		1			1	1	1	1		
SUNY ALBANY	3		1	1	1						1
ST JOHNS U NY	3	1		1		1	1	1			
SOUTHERN METH U TX	3					1	1				
SUNY BINGHAMTON	3	1			1		1	1			1
MONTANA SU	3									1	
U OF RHODE ISLAND	3	1	1	1	1	1		1			1
U OF LOUISVILLE KY	3						1				
U OF SC COLUMBIA	3	1	1					1			1
MARQUETTE U WI	3	1	1		1						1
U OF DELAWARE	3		1								1
BOWLING GREEN SU OH	4							1			1
U OF AKRON OH	4										
NORTH DAKOTA SU	4		1			1		1			1
U OF NEVADA RENO	4	1	1								1
U OF SOUTH DAKOTA	4	1			1						
INDIANA SU	4			1	1	1					
IDAHO SU	4							1			
WESTERN MICHIGAN U	4	1	1								1
MIAMI U OH	4	1	1								1
EAST TEXAS SU	4										

KEY: Research

46 - Demographic studies of commuters
47 - Commuter needs assessment
48 - Commuter developmental assessment
49 - Commuter and resident student comparison
50 - Freshman studies only
51 - Longitudinal studies
52 - Commuter usage of facilities and services
53 - Faculty and staff attitudes towards commuters
54 - Other (See next page)
55 - Person designated to deal with commuters

THE NATIONAL CLEARINGHOUSE FOR COMMUTER PROGRAMS

The primary focus of the National Clearinghouse for Commuter Programs is on students in higher education who do not live in institution-owned housing - off-campus students. The Clearinghouse has been created to share data concerning characteristics and needs of commuter students and to establish channels of communication among institutions interested and/or involved in services, programs, advocacy, and research with regard to off-campus students.

Services

. The Commuter is a quarterly publication of articles of concern to (and often written by) the Clearinghouse membership. Recent issues have focused on off-campus housing, programming, and transportation issues.

. References on Commuting Students - Revised and published annually, the "References" is a comprehensive bibliography (currently over 400 citations) of relevant literature on commuter students and commuter institutions.

. Commuter Institution Index - An annually updated compendium of programs and services offered by various commuter institutions, the "Index" also contains interesting demographic comparisons among a broad range of institutions. The "Index" can also be used to locate institutions offering specific programs or services, or to determine what types of functions are offered by a specific institution.

. Files - The Clearinghouse maintains data files containing relevant research bulletins, copies of brochures, program descriptions, needs assessments, and other publications from commuter institutions across the country.

. Referral Network - Through its file information and its liaison with the American College Personnel Association Commission XVII on Commuter Programs, the Clearinghouse links individuals with specific concerns with those who have tried and/or established programs in response to those concerns.

Membership in the National Clearinghouse is $20.00 per year and includes a year's subscription to The Commuter (plus copies of three back issues upon joining), the current editions of the "References" and the "Index", and convenient access to the Clearinghouse files. To join, send the form below (or a reasonable facsimile) and a check payable to the University of Maryland to: National Clearinghouse for Commuter Programs, 1195 Student Union, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742.

Name of person to receive publication:_____

Title:_____ Institution_____

Address_____

City:_____ State:_____ Zip:_____

Telephone: ( )_____